Breaking the theoretical scaling limit for predicting quasi-particle energies: The stochastic GW approach

Daniel Neuhauser, Yi Gao, Christopher Arntsen, and Cyrus Karshenas
Department of Chemistry, University of California at Los Angeles, CA-90095 USA

Eran Rabani
School of Chemistry, The Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

Roi Baer
Fritz Haber Center for Molecular Dynamics, Institute of Chemistry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

arXiv:1402.5035v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 20 Feb 2014

We develop a formalism to calculate the quasi-particle energy within the GW many-body perturbation correction to the density functional theory (DFT). The occupied and virtual orbitals of the Kohn-Sham (KS) Hamiltonian are replaced by stochastic orbitals used to evaluate the Green function, the polarization potential, and thereby the GW self-energy. The stochastic GW (sGW) relies on novel theoretical concepts such as stochastic time-dependent Hartree propagation, stochastic matrix compression and spatial/temporal stochastic decoupling techniques. Beyond the theoretical interest, the formalism enables *linear scaling* GW calculations breaking the theoretical scaling limit for GW as well as circumventing the need for energy cutoff approximations. We illustrate the method for silicon nanocrystals of varying sizes with $N_e > 3000$ electrons.

The GW approximation [1, 2] to many-body perturbation theory (MBPT) [3] offers a reliable and accessible theory for quasi-particles (QPs) and their energies [2, 4–18], enabling estimation of electronic excitations [19–25] quantum conductance [26–30] and level alignment in hybrid systems [31, 32]. Practical use of GW for large systems is severely limited because of the steep CPU and memory requirements as system size increases. The most computationally intensive element in the GW method, the calculation of the polarization potential (screen Coulomb interaction), involves an algorithmic complexity that scales as the fourth power of the system size [33, 34]. Various approaches have been developed to reduce the computational bottlenecks of the GW approach [8, 33–36]. Despite these advances, GW calculations are still quite expensive for many of the intended applications in the fields of materials science, surface science and nanoscience.

In this letter we develop a stochastic, orbital-less, formalism for the GW theory, unique in that it does not reference occupied or virtual orbitals and orbital energies of the KS Hamiltonian. While the approach is inspired by recent developments in electronic structure theory using stochastic orbitals [37–41] it introduces three powerful and basic notions: Stochastic decoupling, stochastic matrix compression and stochastic time-dependent Hartree (sTDH) propagation. The result is a stochastic formulation of GW, where the QP energies become random variables sampled from a distribution with a mean equal to the exact GW energies and a statistical error proportional to the inverse number of stochastic orbitals (iterations, I_{sGW}).

We illustrate the sGW formalism for silicon nanocrystals (NCs) with varying sizes and band gaps [42, 43] and demonstrate that the CPU time and memory required by sGW scales *nearly linearly* with system size, thereby providing means to study QPs excitations in large systems of experimental and technological interest.

In the reformulation of the GW approach, we treat the QP energy ($\varepsilon_{QP} = \hbar\omega_{QP}$) as a variable rather than a solution to an eigenvalue problem, and rewrite the QP perturbative correction [2, 5] to the KS energy as:

$$\varepsilon_{QP}(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon + \tilde{\Sigma}^P(\omega_{QP};\varepsilon) + \Sigma^X(\varepsilon) - \Sigma^{XC}(\varepsilon), \qquad (1)$$

where ε replaces the KS orbital energy (also treated as a variable) and can be determined from the desired value (highest occupied or lower virtual) of the density of states of the KS Hamiltonian available from the sDFT [40]. The frequency domain polarization self-energy $\tilde{\Sigma}^P(\omega,\varepsilon)$ is given in terms of the Fourier transform of the time domain counterpart $\Sigma^P(t,\varepsilon)$ and:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma^P(t;\varepsilon) &= \tfrac{1}{Q(\varepsilon)} tr\left[f_\sigma\left(\hat{h}_{KS}-\varepsilon\right)^2 \hat{\Sigma}^P(t;\varepsilon)\right],\\
\Sigma^X(\varepsilon) &= \tfrac{1}{Q(\varepsilon)} tr\left[f_\sigma\left(\hat{h}_{KS}-\varepsilon\right)^2 \hat{\Sigma}^X\right],\\
\Sigma^{XC}(\varepsilon) &= \tfrac{1}{Q(\varepsilon)} tr\left[f_\sigma\left(\hat{h}_{KS}-\varepsilon\right)^2 v_{XC}\right],\\
Q(\varepsilon) &= tr\left[f_\sigma\left(\hat{h}_{KS}-\varepsilon\right)^2\right].
\end{aligned} \qquad (2)$$

Here, $\Sigma^X(\varepsilon)$ and $\Sigma^{XC}(\varepsilon)$ are the exchange and exchange-correlation self-energies, respectively, and $Q(\varepsilon)$ is a normalization factor. All three quantities can be calculated using a linear-scaling stochastic approach, as detailed in the supplementary information. In the above, $v_{XC}(\mathbf{r})$ is the exchange-correlation potential of the KS-DFT Hamiltonian $\hat{h}_{KS}$ and $f_\sigma(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon^2/2\sigma^2}$ is an energy filter func-

tion of width σ [44]. In the GW approximation, the matrix elements of the polarization self-energy

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^P(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon) &= \left\langle \mathbf{r}_1 \left| \hat{\Sigma}^P(t;\varepsilon) \right| \mathbf{r}_2 \right\rangle = \\ & i\hbar G_0(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t)\, W^P(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

are expressed in terms of the Green function, $G_0(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t)$

$$i\hbar G_0(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t) \equiv \left\langle \mathbf{r}_1 \left| e^{-i\hat{h}_{KS}t/\hbar}\hat{P}_\mu(t) \right| \mathbf{r}_2 \right\rangle, \tag{4}$$

and the polarization potential

$$W^P(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon) \equiv \langle \mathbf{r}_1 | u_C \otimes \chi(t;\varepsilon) \otimes u_C | \mathbf{r}_2 \rangle. \tag{5}$$

In the above equations, $\hat{P}_\mu(t) \equiv \left(\theta(t) - \theta_\beta\left(\mu - \hat{h}_{KS}\right)\right)$, $\theta(E)$ and $\theta_\beta(E) = \frac{1}{2}(1+\mathrm{erf}(\beta E))$ are the Heaviside and a smoothed-Heaviside functions, respectively, μ is the chemical potential, $u_C(|\mathbf{r}_1-\mathbf{r}_2|) = e^2/4\pi\epsilon_0|\mathbf{r}_1-\mathbf{r}_2|$ is the bare Coulomb potential, and $\chi(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon)$ is the *time-ordered* density-density correlation function [3]. The symbol $'\otimes'$ represents a space convolution.

For performing the trace operations in Eqs. (1)-(4), we use a set of *real* stochastic orbitals $\phi(\mathbf{r})$ [45–47] for which $\mathbf{1} = \langle |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \rangle_\phi$ where $\langle\cdots\rangle_\phi$ denotes a statistical average over ϕ. The choice of $\phi(\mathbf{r})$ satisfying these requirements is not unique. The form used here assigns a value of $\pm h^{-3/2}$ at each grid point with equal probability, where h is the grid spacing. This allows us to rewrite the self-energy in Eq. (2) as:

$$\Sigma^P(t;\varepsilon) = \left\langle \iint \phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}_1)\, \Sigma^P(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon)\, \phi(\mathbf{r}_2)\, d^3r_1 d^3r_2 \right\rangle_\phi \tag{6}$$

where $|\phi_\varepsilon\rangle = f_\sigma\left(\hat{h}_{KS}-\varepsilon\right)|\phi\rangle$ is the corresponding filtered state at energy ε, which can be obtained by a Chebyshev expansion of the Gaussian function with σ chosen as a small parameter [48, 49]. We note in passing that it is possible to obtain simultaneously $\Sigma^P(t;\varepsilon)$ for several values of ε (more details are given in the supplementary information).

To obtain $\Sigma^P(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon)$ in Eq. (6) we need to calculate the non-interacting Green function $i\hbar G_0(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t)$ in Eq. (4) and the polarization potential $W^P(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t;\varepsilon)$ in Eq. (5). For the former, we introduce an additional set of real stochastic orbitals, $\zeta(\mathbf{r})$, and describe a:

$$i\hbar G_0(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t) = \langle \zeta_\mu(\mathbf{r}_1,t)\,\zeta(\mathbf{r}_2)\rangle_\zeta, \tag{7}$$

where $\zeta_\mu(\mathbf{r},t) = \left\langle \mathbf{r}\left| e^{-i\hat{h}_{KS}t/\hbar}\hat{P}_\mu(t)\right|\zeta\right\rangle$ is a "propagated-projected" stochastic orbital which can be obtained by a Chebyshev expansion of the function $e^{-i\varepsilon t/\hbar}(\theta(t)-\theta_\beta(\varepsilon-\mu))$ [48, 49]. One appealing advantage of the stochastic form of Eq. (7) is that it provides a compact representation for $G_0(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2,t)$, equivalent to *matrix compression* where $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ are decoupled. This allows a drastic simplification of the representation of the polarization self-energy obtained by combining Eqs. (6) and (7):

$$\Sigma^P(t;\varepsilon) = \left\langle\left\langle \phi_\varepsilon\zeta_\mu(t)^* | u_C\otimes\chi(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\right\rangle\right\rangle_{\phi\zeta} \tag{8}$$

Next, we employ a temporal decoupling scheme achieved by introducing an additional set of real stochastic orbitals $\psi(\mathbf{r})$:

$$\Sigma^P(t;\varepsilon) = \left\langle\left\langle \phi_\varepsilon\zeta_\mu(t)^*\right|\psi\right\rangle\langle\psi|u_C\otimes\chi(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle\right\rangle_{\phi\zeta\psi}, \tag{9}$$

which allows us to treat the term $\left\langle \phi_\varepsilon\zeta_\mu(t)^*\right|\psi\rangle$ separately from the term $\langle\psi|u_C\otimes\chi(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle$. Note that the average $\langle\cdots\rangle_{\phi\zeta\psi}$ in Eq. (9) is performed over I_{sGW} pairs of ϕ and ζ stochastic orbitals, and for each such pair we use a different set of N_ψ stochastic $\psi's$. The term $\left\langle \phi_\varepsilon\zeta_\mu(t)^*\right|\psi\rangle$ is straightforward to obtain while $\langle\psi|u_C\otimes\chi(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle$ is determined from the time-retarded polarization potential, $\langle\psi|u_C\otimes\chi^r(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle$, calculated from the linear response relation:

$$\langle\psi|u_C\otimes\chi^r(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle = \langle\psi|u_C|\,\delta n(t)\rangle, \tag{10}$$

where $\delta n(\mathbf{r},t)$ is the causal density response to the impulsive perturbation $\delta v(\mathbf{r},t) = \langle\mathbf{r}|u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle\,\delta(t)$ calculated by the time-dependent Hartree (TDH) approach [50–52]. Alternatively, a full time-dependent density functional theory (TD-DFT) [53] is often found to yield better QP energies than the TDH propagation [21]. Once the retarded response, $\langle\psi|u_C|\,\delta n(t)\rangle$, is calculated and stored for each time t, the corresponding time-ordered response $\langle\psi|u_C\otimes\chi(t)\otimes u_C|\,\zeta\phi\rangle$ is obtained by a standard transformation (See Fetter and Walecka [3] Eq. (13.20)).

The TDH (or TD-DFT) propagation is usually performed using the full set of occupied KS eigenfunctions, but we deliberately avoid these in our formulation. Instead, we introduce, once again, a *stochastic* way to perform the TDH or TD-DFT propagation where an new set of N_φ occupied projected stochastic orbitals, $\varphi_\mu(\mathbf{r},0) = \left\langle\mathbf{r}|\theta\left(\mu-\hat{h}_{KS}\right)|\varphi\right\rangle$ are used (as before $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ are real random orbitals for which $\mathbf{1} = \langle|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|\rangle_\varphi$). The so called sTDH (or sTD-DFT) propagation is carried out identically to a TDH propagation, except that one propagates only the N_φ stochastic orbitals and at each time step (rather than all occupied orbitals), and the density is calculated as $n(\mathbf{r},t) = \left\langle|\varphi(\mathbf{r},t)|^2\right\rangle_\varphi$ from which the Hartree potential is updated in the usual way (see supplementary information for additional details). We verified that for a given accuracy the number of propagated orbitals N_φ does not increase (and actually somewhat decreases) with system size, as will be detailed in a future publication. This suggests that the computational complexity (storage and computational time) of the sTDH (or sTD-DFT) step scales linearly with system size.

We validate our formalism by first applying it to a small model system (we used a model problem of 14 electrons and



Figure 1. Comparison of the stochastic (red) and deterministic (black) estimates of the real part of the polarization self-energy $\tilde{\Sigma}^P(\omega,\varepsilon)$ for the 14 electron benchmark model corresponding to the highest quasi-hole and lowest quasi-electron levels. Frequency scale in arbitrary units.

$4\times4\times4$ point grid) where a deterministic GW calculation is available as a benchmark. In Fig. 1 we show the estimates for the real part of the polarization self-energy, obtained by both the deterministic and the stochastic methods. The stochastic calculation employed a large number of iterations ($I_{sGW} = 10,000$), to achieve small statistical errors. The agreement between the results of the two calculations for all relevant frequencies as seen in Fig. 1 is impressive for both the highest quasi-hole and lowest quasi-electron levels, validating the stochastic formulation.

Table I. The number of electrons (N_e), size of grid (N_g), number of sDFT iterations (I_{sDFT}), number of stochastic orbitals in sTD-DFT (N_φ), the value of β in the sGW calculation, and the resulting QP energy gap (E^{QP}_{gap}).

System	N_e	N_g	I_{sDFT}	N_φ	β^{-1}_{GW} (E_h)	E^{QP}_{gap} (eV)
$Si_{35}H_{36}$	176	60^3	3000	16	0.020	6.19 ± 0.13
$Si_{87}H_{76}$	424	64^3	1600	16	0.012	4.82 ± 0.14
$Si_{147}H_{100}$	688	70^3	800	16	0.010	4.10 ± 0.13
$Si_{353}H_{196}$	1608	90^3	400	16	0.008	2.99 ± 0.13
$Si_{705}H_{300}$	3120	108^3	200	16	0.007	2.24 ± 0.15

Next we performed a set of sGW calculations for a series of hydrogen passivated silicon NCs as detailed in Table I. The sDFT method was used to generate the Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian within the local density approximation (LDA). The calculations employed a real-space grid of spacing $h = 0.6a_0$, the Troullier-Martins norm-conserving pseudopotentials [54] and fast Fourier transforms for implementing the kinetic and Hartree energies. The CPU time needed to converge the sDFT to a statistical error in the total energy per electron of about 10 meV was ≈ 5000 hrs for the entire range of systems studied.

In the lower panel of Fig. 2 we plot the QP energies of



Figure 2. Lower panel: QP energies for the highest quasi-hole (black) and lowest quasi-electron (red) levels. Middle panel: QP energy difference from the KS energy for the highest quasi-hole (black) and lowest quasi-electron (red) levels. Upper panel: CPU time versus the number of electrons. The power law fit (solid line) yields an exponent close to 1.

the highest quasi-hole and lowest quasi-electron levels for the silicon NCs. We have used $I_{sGW} = 1000$ stochastic iterations and for each stochastic choice of ϕ and ζ, we used $N_\psi = 100$ stochastic ψ's to generate the results. As can be seen, the statistical error in the values of the QP energies is very small (< 0.1 eV) and can be reduced by increasing I_{sGW}. The quasi-hole (quasi-electron) energy increases (decreases) with system size due to quantum confinement effect. As a results of the larger effective mass of the holes the quasi-hole energy nearly plateaus for the range of system studied. The middle panel of Fig. 2 shows the QP energy difference from the KS values for the holes and electrons. Larger deviations are observed for small NCs in the strong confinement regime. The corrections for the holes are larger than that for the electrons, which is rather surprising.

The upper panel of Fig. 2 shows the scaling of the entire sGW approach for the combined calculation of $\Sigma^X(\varepsilon)$, $\Sigma^{XC}(\varepsilon)$, and $\Sigma^P(t;\varepsilon)$. The scaling of the approach is nearly linear with the number of electrons, breaking the quadratic theoretical limit. It is important to note that for almost the entire range of NC sizes the sGW calculations were cheaper than the sDFT.

In conclusion, we have reformulated the GW approxi-

mation to many-body perturbation theory for calculating QP energies as a stochastic process without referring to the single-particle orbitals (or equivalently to the single-particle density matrix) and the corresponding orbital energies. The paradigm shift presented here by the fully quantum sGW formalism also removes the barrier for addressing larger systems, close to the mesoscopic limit. Indeed, the application to silicon NCs with system sizes far exceeding the current state-of-the-art indicates that the formalism scales nearly linearly with system size, breaking the theoretical limit. Some of the concepts presented here may likely be applicable to other forms of many-body perturbation theory approximations, such as propagator [55] and Green's function theories[56].

The sGW developed here has several appealing advantages:

- Representation: It is especially suitable for real-space-grid/plane-waves pseudopotential representations for which the Hamiltonian operation on a stochastic orbital scales linearly. These representations are the natural for large-scale electronic structure computations. The approach is will also be useful for periodic systems with very large super-cells.

- Matrix compression: The introduction of the stochastic orbitals circumvents the need to store huge matrices of the Green function and the polarization potential (or the dielectric matrix ϵ) and thus achieves huge savings in memory. The scaling of storage is $O(N_g)$, which makes the sGW approach applicable to large system without referring to cutoff approximations in the unoccupied space [13, 57, 58].

- Computational scaling: The sTDH developed here to obtain the polarization potential scales linearly with system size rendering the entire sGW a linear scaling approach. We find that the scaling of our approach is insensitive to the sparsity of the density matrix and thus represents a significant improvement over existing GW approaches.

- Parallelization: The stochastic character of the approach allows for straightforward parallelization of the sGW calculation: The self-energies are averaged over different stochastic orbitals so each processor performs its own independent contribution to this average.

These features make the sGW a method of choice for studying QP excitations in large complex materials not accessible by other approaches.

R. B. and E. R. gratefully thank the Israel Science Foundation, Grants No. 1020/10 and No. 611/11, respectively. R. B. and D. N. acknowledge the support of the US-Israel Bi-National Science Foundation. D. N., Y. G., C. A. and C. K. are part of the Molecularly Engineered Energy Materials (MEEM), an Energy Frontier Research Center funded by the DOE, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences under Award No. de-sc0001342. Some of the simulations used resources of the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility at Argonne National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-06CH11357.

=

[1] L. Hedin, Phys. Rev. **139**, A796 (1965)
[2] C. Friedrich and A. Schindlmayr, NIC Series **31**, 335 (2006)
[3] A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, *Quantum Thoery of Many Particle Systems* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971) p. 299
[4] M. S. Hybertsen and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1418 (1985)
[5] M. S. Hybertsen and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 5390 (1986)
[6] W. G. Aulbur, M. Stadele, and A. Gorling, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7121 (2000)
[7] A. Stan, N. E. Dahlen, and R. van Leeuwen, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **76**, 298 (2006), http://iopscience.iop.org/0295-5075/76/2/298
[8] M. Shishkin and G. Kresse, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 235102 (2007), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v75/i23/e235102
[9] P. Huang and E. A. Carter, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **59**, 261 (2008), http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.physchem.59.032607.093528
[10] P. E. Trevisanutto, C. Giorgetti, L. Reining, M. Ladisa, and V. Olevano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 226405 (2008), http://prl.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v101/i22/e226405
[11] C. Rostgaard, K. W. Jacobsen, and K. S. Thygesen, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 085103 (2010), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v81/i8/e085103
[12] P. Liao and E. A. Carter, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **13**, 15189 (2011), http://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2011/cp/c1cp20829b
[13] J. Berger, L. Reining, and F. Sottile, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 085126 (2012), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v85/i8/e085126
[14] M. van Setten, F. Weigend, and F. Evers, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **9**, 232 (2012), http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/ct300648t
[15] N. Marom, F. Caruso, X. Ren, O. T. Hofmann, T. Körzdörfer, J. R. Chelikowsky, A. Rubio, M. Scheffler, and P. Rinke, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 245127 (2012), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v86/i24/e245127
[16] L. Y. Isseroff and E. A. Carter, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 235142 (2012), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v85/i23/e235142
[17] S. Refaely-Abramson, S. Sharifzadeh, N. Govind, J. Autschbach, J. B. Neaton, R. Baer, and L. Kronik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 226405 (2012)
[18] F. Caruso, P. Rinke, X. Ren, A. Rubio, and M. Scheffler, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 075105 (Aug 2013), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.88.075105
[19] J. C. Grossman, M. Rohlfing, L. Mitas, S. G. Louie, and M. L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 472 (2001)
[20] G. Onida, L. Reining, and A. Rubio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 601 (2002)
[21] M. L. Tiago and J. R. Chelikowsky, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 205334 (2006), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v73/i20/e205334

[22] S. Refaely-Abramson, R. Baer, and L. Kronik, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 075144 (2011)

[23] F. Caruso, P. Rinke, X. Ren, M. Scheffler, and A. Rubio, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 081102 (2012), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v86/i8/e081102

[24] X. Blase, C. Attaccalite, and V. Olevano, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 115103 (2011)

[25] S. V. Faleev, M. van Schilfgaarde, and T. Kotani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 126406 (Sep 2004), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.126406

[26] S. Y. Quek, L. Venkataraman, H. J. Choi, S. G. Louie, M. S. Hybertsen, and J. B. Neaton, Nano Lett. **7**, 3477 (2007)

[27] S. Y. Quek, J. Neaton, M. S. Hybertsen, E. Kaxiras, and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 066807 (2007), http://prl.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v98/i6/e066807

[28] K. S. Thygesen and A. Rubio, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 115333 (2008), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v77/i11/e115333

[29] P. Myöhänen, A. Stan, G. Stefanucci, and R. van Leeuwen, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 115107 (2009), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v80/i11/e115107

[30] M. Della Sala, F.Angela, G. Kladnik, A. Cossaro, A. Verdini, M. Kamenetska, I. Tamblyn, S. Y. Quek, J. B. Neaton, D. Cvetko, A. Morgante, and L. Venkataraman, Nano Lett. **10**, 2470 (2010)

[31] J. B. Neaton, M. S. Hybertsen, and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 216405 (2006), http://prl.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v97/i21/e216405

[32] I. Tamblyn, P. Darancet, S. Y. Quek, S. A. Bonev, and J. B. Neaton, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 201402 (2011), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v84/i20/e201402

[33] H.-V. Nguyen, T. A. Pham, D. Rocca, and G. Galli, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 081101 (2012), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v85/i8/e081101

[34] J. Deslippe, G. Samsonidze, D. A. Strubbe, M. Jain, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, Comput. Phys. Commun. **183**, 1269 (2012), http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010465511003912

[35] T. A. Pham, H.-V. Nguyen, D. Rocca, and G. Galli, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155148 (2013), http://prb.aps.org/abstract/PRB/v87/i15/e155148

[36] D. Foerster, P. Koval, and D. Sánchez-Portal, J. Chem. Phys. **135**, 074105 (2011), http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jcp/135/7/10.1063/1.3624731

[37] R. Baer and E. Rabani, Nano Lett. **12**, 2123 (2012)

[38] D. Neuhauser, E. Rabani, and R. Baer, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **9**, 24 (2013)

[39] D. Neuhauser, E. Rabani, and R. Baer, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **4**, 1172 (2013)

[40] R. Baer, D. Neuhauser, and E. Rabani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 106402 (Sep 2013), http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.106402

[41] Q. Ge, Y. Gao, R. Baer, E. Rabani, and D. Neuhauser, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **5**, 185 (2014)

[42] L. W. Wang and A. Zunger, J. Phys. Chem. **98**, 2158 (1994)

[43] S. Ogut, J. R. Chelikowsky, and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1770 (1997)

[44] D. Neuhauser, J. Chem. Phys. **93**, 2611 (1990)

[45] D. A. Drabold and O. F. Sankey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3631 (1993)

[46] L. W. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 10154 (1994)

[47] R. Silver, H. Roeder, A. Voter, and J. Kress, in *Maximum Entropy and Bayesian Methods* (Springer, 1996) pp. 187–194

[48] R. Kosloff, J. Phys. Chem. **92**, 2087 (1988)

[49] R. Kosloff, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **45**, 145 (1994)

[50] S. Baroni, S. de Gironcoli, A. Dal Corso, and P. Giannozzi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 515 (2001)

[51] R. Baer and D. Neuhauser, J. Chem. Phys. **121**, 9803 (2004)

[52] D. Neuhauser and R. Baer, J. Chem. Phys. **123**, 204105 (2005)

[53] E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 997 (1984)

[54] N. Troullier and J. L. Martins, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 1993 (1991)

[55] J. Linderberg and Y. Ohrn, *Propagators in quantum chemistry* (J. Wiley & Sons, 2004)

[56] L. Cederbaum and W. Domcke, Adv. Chem. Phys **36**, 205 (1977)

[57] M. M. Rieger, L. Steinbeck, I. White, H. Rojas, and R. Godby, Comput. Phys. Commun. **117**, 211 (1999), http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S001046559800174X

[58] G. Samsonidze, M. Jain, J. Deslippe, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 186404 (2011)